

JPRS 69754

8 September 1977

TRANSLATIONS ON EASTERN EUROPE  
POLITICAL, SOCIOLOGICAL, AND MILITARY AFFAIRS  
No. 1443

**DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A**  
Approved for Public Release  
Distribution Unlimited

20000329 165

U. S. JOINT PUBLICATIONS RESEARCH SERVICE

Reproduced From  
Best Available Copy

**EAST**

**EUROPE**

HUNGARY

# KPOE SPOKESMAN COMMENTS ON NEUTRON BOMB DEBATE

Vienna VOLKSSTIMME in German 4 Aug 77 p 2

[Article by Otto Janecek: "To Live With the Neutron Bomb? No Hesitation on the Part of ORF [Austrian Radio and Television]!" ]

[Text] The debate about the neutron bomb in "Club 2" [ORF program] begins with an excellent film on the subject made by North German Radio and Television. It shows how a neutron bomb is launched. Its effect is illustrated in pictures: the bomb explodes in the air and, in comparison with the traditional atom bomb, destroys "only a comparatively small area, leaving the buildings outside the area intact to a large extent. Its radiation, however, extinguishes any kind of human life over a wide radius."

U.S. General Haig is shown. He claims that the new bomb "has been enthusiastically (!) welcomed by the NATO allies in Europe." Then a former deputy director of the CIA is interviewed. He is less enthusiastic. First, he does not think the military effect of the bomb is all that fantastic. Second, he points out that the bomb is "humane" only toward buildings. Third (and this agrees with statements by numerous West German experts, even military men like Count Baudissin), anything which made atomic war more probable was extremely dangerous. For the small atomic bang would inevitably lead to the big one. And it requires two to determine the boundary between a "tactical" and "strategic" atomic war.

But then things change suddenly. It is time for the debate. The most prominent participants: Mr Emmerich, the ORF correspondent in Bonn; a Mr Wolfram von Raven, former general of the FRG Armed Forces; Mr Possanner of DIE PRESSE; Austrian Armed Forces General Kuntner and Janos Hajdu, foreign political editor of NEPSZABADSAG. The Western gentlemen (including the Austrian "neutrals") are agreed that one simply must live with the neutron bomb. Emmerich: "We will not make the world better than it is...." (Hajdu interrupts: "We will so...") The neutron bomb simply was the result of a "dynamic technological development" which could not be met with "static means" any longer. (The implication: any efforts for disarmament or even limitation of the armaments race are only stupid attempts by "statically" thinking politicians.) The gentlemen then indulge in

sandbox games, admitting to each other that they belong to different "schools of thought" on what kind of course a third world war would take. Everyone is in his element--in talking shop. Strategic atom bomb with intercontinental missiles. Single warheads. Kill and overkill. Tactical atomic weapon. Fire and backfire. Neutron bomb. As I have said--very humane. People are no longer maimed and burned; only their central nervous system is destroyed by radiation. That looks much better in pictures. They can live on--a few hours, a few weeks, a few months--before they die. Again, a lively dispute between "schools of thought": Will that do or will that not do as far as an armored attack is concerned? Then there is yet another "school of thought"--detente. But this one does not mean much in this circle.

To live with the neutron bomb? The gentlemen present are almost all prepared to do so. They probably already have their country homes with neutron bomb-proof shelters. And toward private property, after all, the bomb is really very humane. General Kuntner: "If anything, the neutron bomb is the lesser evil." Thank you, General.

Quite a remarkable debate on the television of a neutral country which would inevitably be involved in an atomic war in central Europe. But in contrast with the anti-neutron bomb "propaganda" of the North German Radio and Television (which is duly disparaged), here the problem is approached with complete "objectivity" and "lack of bias." And that in the full conviction that one "can't do anything anyway" about the armaments race. The armaments race is opposed hereabouts only by two or three government politicians in Sunday addresses. The federal president. The federal chancellor. And Deputy Czernetz. This, in order that the government offices of the socialist countries may have something to file away by way of official Austrian opinion. In the largest Austrian media, it is a horse of quite a different color.

The Hungarian journalist Hajdu tries to approach the question politically. What did Carter really want if just now, when there were SALT talks, the Vienna MBFR talks and the negotiations in Belgrade, he was coming with his cruise missiles? And then with the neutron bomb? And then.... Hajdu: "I am also bothered when I hear shop talk about mass murder." He has come to the wrong address here. A nuclear physicist, demonstrating before the camera that scientific knowledge can easily go hand in hand with virtual political feeble-mindedness, bickers: "Well, invariably those who say "rather red than dead" are now also against the neutron bomb." Mr Vonach wants the red to be dead. Neutron bomb-dead.

And when the Hungarian colleague points out that the socialist countries are somewhat underrepresented at this debate, and that it might have been quite a good idea to invite a Soviet colleague who specializes in military affairs, he is slapped down by Mr Emmerich: "Mr Hajdu, we could have conducted this discussion just as easily without a colleague from the Eastern bloc....We can talk as we please on any subject in a free country; for that, we do not need the socialist countries at all."

Of course, that is what they always do anyway. The ORF as it lives and breathes. Objective through and through. Walking over corpses here.

PARTICIPANT SCORES AUSTRIAN TV DEBATE ON NEUTRON BOMB

Budapest NEPSZABADSAG in Hungarian 7 Aug 77 pp 4-5

[Article by Janos Hajdu: "Lieber Tot, Als Rot," or the Story of a Vienna Television Debate]

[Text] The rhyming lines mean in Hungarian that it is better to be dead than red. Earlier, this invention of the political right was often recited in the reverse in German-speaking areas, and was designed to express that the type of "capitulating politicians" such as, let's say, Willy Brandt, Helmut Schmidt or Bruno Kreisky, who are believers in peaceful coexistence with the socialist countries, in reality throw themselves into the arms of the communists rather than accept heroic death. This then is the basic stupidity.

The one who this time took a stand on death's side, before the eyes of the entire Austrian public, is not a politician but a nuclear physicist. He is a fitting political disciple of, for example, Edward Teller, though--judging from a layman's point of view--a lot separates him from Teller in the matter of scientific qualifications. And the reason and opportunity for demonstrating this death-defying determination was provided by the fact that at the beginning of the week, on the program "Club 2" of the Austrian television, the conversation in the late night debate, for over 2 hours, was about the neutron bomb. The writer of these lines was among the participants invited to the debate, and, as such, also takes the liberty for expressing his subsequent opinion.

The debate's title still allowed one to guess that a broad spectrum of opinions would be heard, since my respected colleague and old-time acquaintance from Bonn, Klaus Emmerich, who was moderator, asked: "To live with the neutron bomb?" Frankly, I was very much surprised when, right at the debate's beginning, it became obvious that I was the only one in the company who does not like the idea. General Kuntner, director of the Austrian Military Academy, professed to be a complete believer in the new bomb, though he emphasized that at this time he is not declaring an official opinion. (Is it perhaps so officially also!?) Colleague Possanner,

editor of the Vienna DIE PRESSE, was seconding rather than watchfully criticizing the general, which was less surprising only because DIE PRESSE generally attacks and only rarely supports the policy of detente in the world.

The NATO correspondent in Brussels of one of the large papers in New York, while he let it be known that he expects a positive decision from his President in the neutron bomb matter--that is, the ordering of the production of the new weapon--was visibly rather happy about how much his European colleagues liked the idea.

The most trustworthy debating partner--I say this sincerely--was Mr Wolfram von Raven, one of the FRG's best known military specialists in journalism, earlier himself a professional top officer, who did not beat around the bush, did not speak about peace on the one hand and the necessity of the bomb on the other, but threw it into the eyes of the viewers and the debate partners: he considers all those things damaging which have happened in the last decade, trademarked with Kissinger's or Brandt's name, errors from the Western viewpoint. He finally sees "new" and "good" tendencies in American policy which are worthy of support. Mr von Raven also did the favor for the Austrian viewers of explaining with the Prussian pedantry of famed German predecessors that the neutron bomb is really a blessing, because it is much cleaner than the heretofore used dirty atom bomb. (For those who might not know, the neutron bomb kills essentially by means of radiation; its pressure and thermal effects are relatively low, and therefore it is famous for the fact that dropping it on Vienna, let's say, would leave the Burg and Stephanskirche undamaged; there just would not be any locals or tourists to enjoy their beauty.)

I am afraid the impression may already have been created in the mind of the Hungarian reader that the Austrian national television organized some kind of unheard-of militaristic parade. The thing is not that simple. Finally, in my modest person they have invited someone who is "rather red than dead." The fact is, I was able to elaborate on my views, and, once in a while, I was able to convince my partners that they should not flaunt the fact that they were well-informed about the bomb's details, but rather examine whether it could negatively influence Europe's elementary interests if, in the age of SALT, the Vienna disarmament conference and the results achieved in Helsinki, the American political leadership all of a sudden begins to bring diametrically opposing tendencies into effect.

The Austrian gentlemen were mostly saying that on the one hand they are in favor of peace, but on the other hand this bomb is a "necessary thing." Mr von Raven did not say that he would be in favor of the type of peace which appeared to be obtainable in recent years through compromises. He said that he is in favor of equipping each member of NATO with neutron bombs, because he sees the assurance of security in this.

Thus, by using my definition of words, I could say that only Mr von Raven is a fanatic militarist and immovable anticommunist, even in civilian

life an old-type high German officer. But honestly, I still would not be afraid for the Austrians and for Europe because of him, since he is indisputably in the minority, even in his own country. In this case, I considered the reasoning and behavior of the Austrian opponents to be dangerous. I will try to explain in Budapest also why.

Because it just won't do, and is laden with tremendous dangers, to make people believe that all these miracle weapons really do not affect the strategic order and power relationships of the two great powers, and thus the neutron bomb and the cruise missile are only small peripheral undertakings; there can still be SALT agreements because of this, if "the Russians seriously want it." (Whereas they also know that every one of their efforts for unilateral shift in the power relationship can only bring about a counter-reaction; that is, the arms race accelerates; this is how it has been thus far, and this is what it would cause in the future also, because the socialist countries cannot risk the security of their peoples for even one minute.)

And it just won't go over, even though a very respected general of a militarily neutral capitalist country does it in public, that the Soviet Union is classified as a potential aggressor. This is quite unacceptable particularly in Austria, for the independent national life, the present form of which indicates that the Austrians can be thankful that Soviet policy, always ready for discussions and rational compromises, already over 2 decades ago decided in favor of the Austrian national agreement in order to provide a concrete example of the possibilities of climbing out [sic] of the cold war. It was not because of Moscow that the organizing which began with the Austrian national agreement was not continued at the time, and, after 20 years, we are still only in the early stages of detente.

At one point in the program, when I happened to say that in this debate a Soviet military expert would also have been necessary, my friend Klaus Emmerich informed me in an elevated tone of voice that Austria is a free country, and they are not required to invite anyone from the Soviet bloc.

At any rate, I thanked him for inviting me, though I also wondered whether perhaps only an alibi was needed for something. But at this time I wish to repeat the thanks without the slightest intention of irony. Because I profess that it would be good if--let me mention it one more time--they would debate not with the intention of strengthening prejudices, but for the real need of forming public opinion. And the possibility of intelligent debate is our joint European achievement since Helsinki. This must also be worried about because of the neutron bomb!

By the way, everyone does himself a favor by learning the other's point of view well. Thus even in "free Austria" it is not worth organizing debates about such topics without us, because in the final analysis, it takes two to make a deal. They are uselessly saying there that the neutron bomb is good, if we say that it is bad. They are wasting time

thinking that they can force their cruise missiles upon us, if we say that these must also be discussed if we talk about stopping the arms race, disarmament or arms limitation.

It is a barometer of intentions--what type of intentions is unnecessary to even mention--that in Western Europe they are advertising the neutron bomb in many places. It is too bad that the Vienna television invited such a majority for this debate to begin with, which did the same thing. The national television of a neutral country--even if it is not always the government's mouthpiece--perhaps could keep itself somewhat to the line of the government's foreign policy obligations and efforts!

8584  
CS0: 2500